

B1
cont

34. A method for providing security to a first appliance comprising the steps of:
storing a rule base associated with the first appliance at a second appliance,
communicating a status of the first appliance to the second appliance via a
network facilitates a control of at least one of the first appliance and the second
appliance,
determining an alarm response at the second appliance based on the rule base and
the status of the first appliance,
wherein the first appliance has a first appliance function that is independent of
security, and the second appliance has a second appliance function that is independent of
security.

REMARKS

The original claims 1-16 have been replaced by the enclosed claims 17-34 to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant regards as the invention in view of the prior art.

The following remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action of 3 February 2000.

In the reference Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 9, and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rietkerk (USP 5,748,083); claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rietkerk in view of Hall et al (USP 5,898,831, hereinafter Hall); and claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 11 as being unpatentable over Rietkerk in view of Le Van Suu (USP 5,714,933, hereinafter Suu).

The Applicant's invention is based on a recognition that as home automation technology advances, most home appliances will contain interfaces to a home automation network. Many of these home appliances, such as televisions, stereos, computers, and so on, are also prime target items for theft. In the claimed invention, the same network that is used to control the appliances is used to monitor the security of the appliances.

Rietkerk's security system uses a dedicated connection scheme that is independent of the functional components being secured. Rietkerk specifically cautions against

including the independent security protection device within the device being secured (Rietkerk, column 4, lines 61-67).

Hall's security system is not directed to protecting the physical security of components or appliances, but addresses the security of communications and control within the network (Hall's FIG. 18, and associated text at columns 13 and 14).

Suu's security system, like Rietkerk's, uses a dedicated communications scheme that is independent of a network that controls the appliances that are being secured. Suu teaches independent security protection devices that are fitted into the device being protected (Suu column 2, lines 13-18).

Both Rietkerk and Suu are silent with regard to a network that facilitates control of appliances that are connected to such a network, and Hall is silent with regard to a system for issuing alarms in response to appliance status reports.

Neither Rietkerk, nor Hall, nor Suu, individually or collectively, teach or suggest effecting a security system via a home automation system. Furthermore, because Rietkerk specifically teaches against integrating the devices used for security into the appliances being protected, the Applicant respectfully maintains that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be lead by Rietkerk to the Applicant's invention.

Based on the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's favorable consideration of the enclosed claims, and the subsequent allowance of each claim, 17-34.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. No. 41,508
203-544-8889

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

It is hereby certified that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

On 23 September 2000

By 